

15: U.S. Navy —25 [3]
116, 191, 554, 662, 177.19
636.19

(no date) 1944

Formosans
Japanese

"No information is available as to the standard used in determining knowledge of Japanese. Consequently the official figure of 45.6 percent may be an exaggeration. It is nevertheless true that the campaign to promote the use of Japanese has greatly intensified since the beginning of the China 'Incident' in 1937.

Various methods are used. Town and village police stations record the names of inhabitants considered conversant with Japanese. Periodical inspection of homes and oral questioning determines eligibility for the book. Whenever a Formosan needs recourse to the local authorities for licenses, business purposes, appeals, or other matters, reference is invariably made to the 'blue book'. If the applicant's name appears in the book, he is usually granted his request; if not, he is refused. Obviously there is room for graft and the shutting of official eyes in judging eligibility for the book. A foreigner with a wide acquaintance among Formosan-Chinese states that he knows of a number of instances where a man of some financial influence in the community is listed in the 'blue book' although his knowledge of Japanese is decidedly open to question. Nevertheless, it is understood that the system, only recently inaugurated, is producing results. Formosans have come to realize that without a listing in the book privileges and opportunities are denied."

15: U.S. Navy--25 [5]
116, 191, 208, 554, 177.19
636.19

(no date) 1944

Formosans
Japanese

"Use of Japanese only is permitted in banks and government offices. Even though a Formosan speaks with a clerk who is also Formosan, the language must be Japanese. If the former is unable to converse, an interpreter is required. To stimulate language learning, insignia bearing the legend 'This household speaks the national language' are placed above the door of Formosan homes. Other signs such as 'Speak only the national language' are seen frequently in buses and public places.

A commandant of the Keelung Base said to the press, 'The basis of Japanization is dissemination of the national language. To do this, I believe we must immediately mobilize the motherhood of Taiwan under the slogan 'Raise our children in Japanese'. Even though one may know the national language, to use Taiwanese at all does not befit a 'soldier of the Imperial Army.'"

15: U.S. Navy --27 [5]
116, 591, 177, 554, 596

(no date) 1944

Formosans

"As a usual thing Formosan-Chinese sons remain at home when they marry, bringing in their wives and rearing their children under the guidance of the eldest member of the family. Hence many individuals make up one family, living in patriarchal style. All members of the family share in the work and in the returns from the land, which is held in joint title. Some wealthy Formosans who have profited by cooperating with the Japanese have, as a matter of policy, added Japanese living quarters to their homes or attempt to live in Japanese fashion."

"The marriage itself takes place in two ceremonies. The first consists of a solemn release of the bride from her home. In theory she ceases to be a member of her blood family. Her name is formally struck from the family records during a solemn gathering before the family altar and ancestral tablets. A last ceremonial cup of tea is drunk, a bit of rice is eaten, her name is removed and she is ready to be carried away.

If the wedding is carried out in full tradition, the bridegroom arrives at the bride's house with a suite of attendants and many colorfully prepared gifts. A closed palanquin, which is carried in over the threshold of the bride's house, is put down before her ancestral tablets. Sometimes the bridegroom sends an honored representative to act for him while he himself remains at his own home. The bride is placed in the palanquin and, in theory at least, is not expected to set foot to the earth nor be seen by anyone until she arrives at her new husband's home and is carried over the threshold. Usually one or more of the bride's family accompany her to her new home. The whole procession is strung out as long and impressively as possible along the road, with extremely noisy professional musicians to swell the numbers in the party. As many gifts as can be carried are decorated brilliantly in red paper and cloth and carried with festive cakes and other foods on open carts through the street. Great prestige is gained by a lavish display and no effort is spared to impress the neighbors with the economic well-being of both houses concerned.

15: U. S. Navy--29 [11]
116, 585, 554, 591

(no date) 1944

Formosans-2

A second ceremony now is performed, during which the bride's name is entered upon the family register of the new house. Unless some disastrous thing occurs she is thereafter committed to complete obedience to the elders in the new household and to her husband.

Feasting follows, during which the bride and groom retire to their bridal chamber.

A good measure of ribaldry and earthy humor accompanies these feasts in proportion to the amount of alcohol consumed.¶

THE SETTING FOR FAMILY LIFE

TABLE 54 (continued)

592
464

B. Per Cent of Male Family Members Occupied	Households of All Types		Purely Family Households		Mixed Households	
	In- cluding Head	Ex- cluding Head	In- cluding Head	Ex- cluding Head	In- cluding Head	Ex- cluding Head
All Households	60.2	45.8	60.6	46.1	56.3	42.4
Households with Head Occupied	62.5	45.6	62.8	45.8	59.0	43.1
Households with Head Not Occupied	36.6	47.7	37.2	48.7	29.5	36.2
Head Occupied in Agriculture	63.0	48.0	63.4	48.2	58.3	45.7
Head Occupied Outside Agr.	61.2	38.4	61.3	38.6	60.4	36.4
Manufacturing	62.0	40.0	62.0	40.2	61.9	38.4
Commerce	58.4	35.5	58.7	35.9	57.0	33.0
Other	62.3	39.3	62.2	39.3	64.5	40.3

* Household heads with no occupation are of course not included. All figures of average persons per household have been rounded, and sometimes will not add to the totals that are shown in other tables; they also will not always produce the exact percentages shown in the lower section of this table.

† "Dependent" refers to persons reporting no occupation in the census.

‡ "Agriculture" includes Forestry.

Source: From *Census of 1920, Detailed Tables, Table 36.*

many of the unoccupied heads were widows who had not re-married, it may be surmised that these households probably had representatives in most occupational groups.

But the most pervasive distinction in engaging in work or leisure within families appeared in those that incorporated outsiders to assist in the work of the household—the mixed households—which made less use of labor by family members than households consisting of family members only. In all but one of the occupational classes of Table 54, employment was less common among members of the families living in mixed households, whether the heads are counted or not. Households with heads not occupied were no exception. Even their subordinate male family members were put to work less often—when not dependent solely on their own resources of manpower, such families supported the greatest amount of leisure that can be found in any of these groups.

Differences of Occupational Status

The variation that these data show in the composition of family groups was recorded at a date before any strong force of Japanese

592
554

THE SETTING FOR FAMILY LIFE

592 government policy could have been felt in this sphere, and so it must
 554 have been a pattern of long standing among the Taiwanese. Though
 there is no way of knowing how much the variation amounted to
 between individual families, between various sources of livelihood
 it was of a very restricted nature. One of the principal features of
 the Chinese social order, however, is that there has been very little
 variation in the general notions that people in different stations
 hold about what forms of conduct are *desirable*—the standards of
 behavior within one's family, or with members of related families,
 have been remarkably similar from group to group, whether or not
 these ideals are completely fulfilled in fact. It has also been charac-
 teristic of this system through many historic periods that it has not
 given rise to rigid status and class distinctions that became heredi-
 tary and remained fixed over time. The commonest sources of pre-
 stige have been associated with symbols that leave some room for
 personal achievements, and not simply privileged birth, in their at-
 tainment—the adoption of genteel as apart from vulgar pursuits, a
 highly esteemed and arduous classical education, and observance of
 traditional forms of ritual that are inappropriate to commonplace
 affairs. Wealth, in almost any form of livelihood, has conferred a
 capacity (e.g., through leisure) to practice these ideals, in many
 ways that poverty denied to the greatest part of the society.

592 Status distinctions of this sort are lines that cut across most if not
 463 all of the occupational divisions recognized in Japanese census prac-
 554 tice, though they obviously were present in some more than others
 (commerce or government service, for example, more than agricul-
 ture or fishing). There are further resources, however, to use in find-
 ing out the extent of variation within occupations. In the one master
 table published with the census of 1920, households were also classi-
 fied by three additional categories of "occupational status"—"Own-
 ers" or "Independent Workers," "Officials," and "Laborers."¹⁰ Each
 household, if the head was occupied, was assigned to one of these
 groups as well as to a regular occupation, so as to specify more fully
 the nature of the head's position. The classification is limited in
 value, for it is not certain that the terms signify anything that is

¹⁰ The English terms are only approximations of the meaning in Japanese. The sense of "Independents" (*Yeh-chu* in the Chinese reading of the term) really is closer to the notion of "master" of an enterprise, somewhat like the term "self-employed" in Western census practice. "Officials" (*Yi-yuan* in Chinese, where it means a lowly and subordinate position) has an honorific connotation in Japanese. "Laborer" (read *Lao-wu* in Chinese) is relatively unambiguous, though it is not clear what line divides it from the others.

THE SETTING FOR FAMILY LIFE

consistent from one occupation to another. In agriculture, a person apparently was "independent" if he actually operated a farm (without distinction between landlords and others), and "laborer" if simply working for another. Agricultural occupations had hardly any positions that could be designated as "officials"; practically all of these were found as government officials or professionals of some kind. These terms are so vague that it is useless to be distressed over what they do not reveal. The service they *do* perform is to separate, within each broad occupational class, the more from the less successful families ("independent" as opposed to "laborers," based on the fortunes of the household head), and to distinguish a few of the cases that do not easily fall in either of these (the "officials," wherever they occurred).

The households of "laborers," in each of the main classes of occupations, were on the average smaller than those in the same occupations that were more prosperous, and smaller even than those of "officials" (see Table 55).¹⁷ The more prosperous ("independent") households were consistently larger than either of the others, whether they were composed solely of family members or included outsiders.²⁷ Mixed households of "independent" heads were the largest of all, and had smaller proportions of outsiders than mixed households of the two other "status" groups. In other words, the wealthier mixed households exceeded the lesser ones in the same manner that had marked the difference between mixed households and those composed of family relatives only—chiefly through the extension of their families rather than the incorporation of outsiders. Not merely in the families of farmers, but within any occupational category, the households of the well-to-do were larger than those of the poorer portions of the population, and in this same pattern.

Households whose heads were "independently" employed had the smallest proportions of their male family members engaged in full-time work. But while leisure, as measured by this standard, was especially common in "independent" households whether outsiders were present or not, it was greater in mixed households of this group

¹⁷ Here, as before, persons living alone ("single-person households") have been excluded, and Table 55 represents co-resident households only. Therefore the actual number of persons per household is less important (e.g., for comparison with later dates in Taiwan or with other data), than the pattern of variation from group to group in Table 55. It happens in this case that most of the single-person households were of the "laborer" group, and so would make the contrast between the two more pronounced if included, by giving the "laborers" a still smaller figure for average household size.

THE SETTING FOR FAMILY LIFE

TABLE 55

592
554
463

AVERAGE SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD AND EXTENT OF MALE EMPLOYMENT
IN FAMILIES CLASSIFIED BY "OCCUPATIONAL STATUS," 1920

By Occupation of Head and Type of Household

	Number of Households	House- holds of All Types	Purely Family House- holds	Mixed House- holds
A. Average Persons per House- hold, both Sexes, by Occupation of Head.				
All Occupations				
a. Independents*	388,635	6.4	6.2	8.7
b. Laborers	128,768	4.4	4.4	5.4
c. Officials	1,462	4.9	4.6	5.8
Agriculture				
a. Independents	309,158	6.6	6.4	9.5
b. Laborers	41,314	4.2	4.2	5.5
Outside Agriculture				
a. Independents	79,477	5.7	5.5	7.1
b. Laborers	87,454	4.5	4.5	5.3
B. Per Cent of Male Family Members Who Reported an Occupation				
All Occupations				
a. Independents		62.0	62.3	57.9
b. Laborers		65.1	65.0	69.2
c. Officials		54.0	52.5	60.9
Agriculture				
a. Independents		62.6	63.0	58.1
b. Laborers		67.6	67.6	65.2
Outside Agriculture				
a. Independents		58.8	59.0	57.3
b. Laborers		64.0	63.7	70.0

* For an explanation of the meaning of these terms, see text.

Source: From *Census of 1920, Detailed Tables*, Table 36.

than anywhere else (see Table 55, Section B). Apparently these more prosperous households also took in outsiders for different purposes. Though not shown in Table 55, the non-relatives in "laborers'" households were chiefly "lodgers" (whatever might be included under this term); the ones in "independent" households were mostly

THE SETTING FOR FAMILY LIFE

listed as employees, who allowed family members to be released from regular work.

Changes Between 1920 and 1930

The decade between 1920 and 1930 produced little change in household or family structure as far as size or other observable features were concerned (see Table 46, above). Families on the average became slightly larger than before, but chiefly by additions to their dependent children and possibly older relatives. When the data for 1920 are put back into terms appropriate for comparison with 1930 (that is, by replacing the single-person households in the computation of averages), it appears that the growth of households was distributed almost uniformly in different portions of the population—it is necessary merely to add the figure of about 4/10 to the average size of households in each major occupational group in 1920 to approximate the size found in that group in 1930. The tables showing household composition were much abridged in 1930, and permit only restricted comparison. In many of the features already used to describe their structure in 1920, however, households in 1930 were practically the same. They were made up almost entirely of family relatives; and presumably the contrasts between mixed and purely family households were unaltered. The same uniformity in sex composition prevailed among the various classes of occupations, with the same exception in the case of households with non-occupied heads. Since these data contribute nothing to the discussion, they have not been reproduced here.

There is more to be gained by comparing economic activities of family members. The burden of dependency was on the average slightly increased between 1920 and 1930, as we have seen (Table 46, above). By 1930, households representing all the main sources of support (i.e., occupations of heads) had smaller proportions of male family members occupied than 10 years before.¹⁸

Agricultural households seemed to share less in this rise of family dependency than others (see Table 56). In part the divergence may be because peasant agriculture is better able to provide a secure livelihood for many who could not find steady employment elsewhere—especially young boys and older men. We have found, in

¹⁸ How the added burden was shared between households of only family and mixed households cannot be ascertained, though the similarity of other patterns leads one to presume that this one remained nearly the same as in 1920. This was one of the items of detail omitted in publication of the 1930 census.

1:Gallin E-4,5 (1957-1958) 1966
AD5 Taiwan Hokkien
Formosa AD1
Taiwan AD6

CHANGING LAND TENURE

and then hired other people, usually immigrants from the mainland, to cultivate the land for them as their tenants.

As the population increased in the later years of the Ch'ing administration there was increasing pressure on the land, and many tenants began to sublease part of the land to others. These subtenants became the lowest rank in a three-stage hierarchal structure of land tenure (Ginsburg, 1953:26-27, 32-33; Grajdanzev, 1942:72-84; T'ang, 1954:23-27).

In 1904, nine years after taking control of Taiwan, the Japanese government altered this hierarchal system of land tenure by buying out the original landowner and conferring the rights of ownership on the tenant. When, in 1923, the Japanese applied the Japanese Civil Code to Taiwan, full legal rights were given to the new owner (the former tenant), who was now officially known as "landlord."

This move benefited the original tenant who was given full ownership rights, but it did nothing to improve the lot of the mass of actual cultivators (now tenants instead of subtenants) whose land rent was no lower than before. As a result, "tenancy disputes" became more numerous beginning in 1927. In that year the Japanese authorities encouraged the formation of local associations of landowners and tenants which were charged with the responsibilities of promoting better relations between landlord and tenant, preventing tenancy disputes, and fostering agricultural production (T'ang, 1954:26). Although many such associations were formed, "the question of farm rents was entirely outside of the jurisdiction of these associations. It [the rent question] was not only left unsolved, but there was even a marked tendency for farm rents to keep on increasing" (T'ang, 1954:26).

In 1939, in the midst of the Sino-Japanese war, the Japanese government issued a rent control law which was applicable to Taiwan and Japan alike. This law had little effect in Taiwan because it did nothing to reduce rents; it only stabilized the situation. (See Grajdanzev, 1942:72-84, especially p. 82 for a discussion of the Japanese attempts to deal with Taiwanese land tenure problems.)

Although the farm tenancy system continued, after 1945 the Japanese rent control law of 1939 was no longer enforced when Taiwan reverted to Chinese rule. With the increase in the rural population and the general upset of the island's economy, farm rents began to rise, and demands increasing security and rent deposits were made. Worst of all, in many cases tenants were arbitrarily evicted (T'ang, 1954:25-28).

Tenancy had been a great problem in Taiwan under both the Japanese and the Chinese since landownership was concentrated in the hands of relatively few owners (Klein, 1958:53; see also his Tables 17 and 18). "The high rate of tenancy reflects the great scarcity of cultivable land in Taiwan in relation to the demand for it. Land-

F
175
89 241
423

F
1.75
161
423
427
554

F
175
177
648
423
427

F
175
648
427

Tn
175
427
161

Tn
423
427

F
[423]
[427]